

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/668,112 | GRANDCOLAS ET AL. |
| | Examiner Pramila Parthasarathy | Art Unit 2136 |

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Pramila Parthasarathy. (3) _____.

(2) John M. Harrington. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 July 2006

Time: 11:30AM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1 & 25

Prior art documents discussed:

None


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner requested amending the Claim limitation to reflect "creating an authentication token and redirecting a web browser.." and directed applicant's attention to Instant application specification pages 2,7,10. Applicant agreed to amend the claims 1 and 25.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)